

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Weshington, D.C. 20231

SLRW: HUMALU; FILING DATE	I See . MAIN IN ACK TO		/110/
07/103,192 10/01/87 BERG	IMAN	L.	JPL87-008
		KRIESS,	Example:
DONALD A. STRECK			
2319 ALAMEDA AVE.		Am um	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 2F VENTURA, CA 93003		237	a
VENTORM, CH 93000		DATE MAILED	-/
This is a communication from the exempler in charge of your rup? COMMISSIONER OF PATERT'S AND TRADE MARKS	cation	DATE MAREEN	11/21/90
	(
This application has been examined Responsive	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-9-42	-
This application has been examined LLA Responsive A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set	~		This action is made final.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the		loned. 35 U.S.C. 133	on the case of this letter.
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART O	F THIS ACTION:		
1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-89	2. 2. □ No	tice re Patent Drawing	PTO-948
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.		•	Application, Form PTO-152
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, F			
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION			
1. Claims 1-4, 6-12 mJ	14-41		are pending in the application
Of the above, claims 6-10, 14-			
2. Claims 5, 13, and 23	·····		have been cancelled.
3. Claims	7. 4.4.		are allowed.
4. Claims 1-4, 11, 12, 19-			are rejected.
6. Ctaims		··.	are objected to.
6. Claims			ction or election requirement.
7. This application has been filed with informal drawing	ngs under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which	n are acceptable for ex	amination purposes.
6. Formal drawings are required in response to this	Office action.		
The corrected or substitute drawings have been reare acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation)		ving, PTO-948).	ler 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawing
10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see	drawings, filed on	has (have) been	approved by the
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed	, has been 🔲 aq	pproved; disapprov	ed (see explanation).
12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority Deen filed in parent application, serial no	under U.S.C. 119. The certifie	d copy has 🔲 been re	ceived not been received
13. Since this application apppears to be in condition f accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quay	or allowance except for formal is, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	matters, prosecution as	to the merits is closed in
14. Other			

Serial No. 103192
Art Unit 237

- 1. Claims 1-4 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 2. Claims 1 and 37 contain much functional language not supported by recitation in the claim of sufficient structure to warrant the presence of the functional language in the claim. Part b) of both claims 1 and 37 seem to describe in functional terms the many functions of the "element selection logic means" without setting forth any structural limitations which could serve to distinguish in some patentable sense.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 11-12, 19-22, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Gordon.
- 4. Gordon teaches a control processor very similar to Applicant's claimed computer and method of operation. Gordon teaches the invention substantially as claimed including accessing instructions (microinstructions) from a sequence, determining a function for each instruction, determining a class of each function (type of microinstruction), and executing the instruction in an optimum manner. See abstract of Gordon. It is noted that Gordon does not disclose of the individual elements being on a common support substrate as is claimed. However, it is common knowledge in the prior art to form a given processing system on a common substrate in the same field of endeavor for

Art Unit 237

the purpose of integrating the system into a more simplified package. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the system of Gordon on a common substrate in order to integrate the system into a more simple package, and thus form a system and method on which the claims read.

- 5. Claims 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Gordon in view of McAulay.
- 6. Gordon discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as above, but does not disclose transmitting and switching signals optically to various elements handling the routines. However, McAulay teaches the use of optical interconnections for processing communication transmissions and switching for the purpose of faster more efficient dynamic reconfigurability. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gordon's signal interconnections with optical interconnections as taught by McAulay in order to provide Gordon with faster and more efficient signal routing and thus form a system and method on which the claims read.
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin A. Kriess whose telephone number is (703) 308-3098.

Art Unit 237

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is $(703)\ 308-0754$.

KAK/jrm November 14, 1990

> KEVIN A. KRIESS EXAMINER ART UNIT 237